

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 (Amended), 3 (Amended), 4 (Amended), 5 (Amended), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and newly added claim 12 remain in the application.

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure because (a) the Abstract of the Disclosure is over 150 words, and (b) there are certain informalities in the specification that require correction. The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature specified in the claims. The Examiner has rejected the claims 1-3, and 7 of the present application as being unpatentable over claims 8, 10, and 13, and claims 8, 29, 35, and 36, respectively, of copending Application No. 10/776,808 based on the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

Turning now to the Examiner objection to the disclosure because (a) the Abstract of the Disclosure is over 150 words, and (b) there are certain informalities that the Examiner has indicated as requiring correction. Applicants have amended the Abstract of the Invention to reduce the number of words therein to below the 150 word limit. Applicants have also amended the specification to correct for both the inadvertent errors cited by the Examiner and additional inadvertent errors that were found by applicants. Applicants believe that such corrections overcome the Examiner's objection to the specification.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature specified in the claims. The Examiner states that "the delay lines in claims 2-5 must be

shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s)". Applicants have amended present claims 2-5 to remove the delay line feature found therein, and have added a new claim 12 to provide the arrangement with a delay line shown in FIG. 6. Applicants believe that claims 2(amended), 3(amended), 4(amended), 5(amended), and newly added claim 12 overcome the objection of the Examiner under 37 CFR 1.83(a) of original claims 2-5.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, and 7 of the present application as being unpatentable over claims 8, 10, and 13, and claims 8, 29, 35, and 36, respectively, of copending Application No. 10/776,808 based on the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of present original claims 1-3 as being unpatentable over the combination of claims 8, 10, and 13 of copending Application No. 10/776,808 based on the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The combination of original claims 1-3 provide the structure of a twisted loop reflector arrangement as shown, for example, in present FIG. 5. Applicants contend that the combination of claims 8, 10, and 13 of the copending Application No. 10/776,808 do not provide a twisted loop reflector arrangement as is recited in present claim 1, 2(amended), and 3(amended). More particularly, claim 8 of the copending application recites the structure of **a stabilized laser system comprising at least one laser** that functions as recited in claim 8, **and a feedback signal generating means** coupled to the at least one laser **that provides a predetermined wavelength shifted feedback signal back to the at least one laser** and a

predetermined output signal from the stabilized laser system that peaks essentially at a desired wavelength. Claim 10 of the copending application is dependent on claim 8 and recites that the at least one laser is a single laser, and that the structure of the feedback signal generating means comprises a main transmission filter and a power splitter coupled between the output of the laser and the output of the stabilized laser system. Claim 10 further recites that signals received at a first port of the power splitter are divided into first and second portions that are delivered to a second port coupled to the output of the stabilized laser system and a third port, and a feedback transmission filter. The feedback transmission filter has a predetermined second spectral response for receiving the second portion from the third port of the power splitter at a first port thereof and generating a filtered output signal at a second port thereof that is coupled back to the laser **either via** the first port thereof and the third port of the power splitter, **or via** the second port of the main transmission filter and the second port of the power splitter. Claim 13 of the copending application is dependent on claim 10 and recites that the power splitter is coupled either between the laser and the main transmission filter or the main transmission filter and the output of the stabilized laser system, and that **the feedback signal generating means further comprises (a) a second feedback transmission filter** where a first port thereof is coupled to receive a signal from a fourth port of the power splitter and generates a filtered output signal at a second port thereof, **and**

(b) **a reflector coupled to the second port of the second feedback transmission filter for returning a reflected signal therefrom back through the second transmission filter to the fourth port of the power splitter.** From the above discussion of claims 8, 10, and 13 of the copending application, these claims form a structure comprising **only a single power splitter, a main transmission filter, first and second feedback transmission filters, and a reflector coupled to the second feedback transmission filter.** If one compares the overall structure produced by claims 8, 10, and 13 to that shown, for example, in FIG. 5 of the present invention, and as is recited in present claims 1, 2(amended), and 3(amended), claims 8, 10, and 13 of the copending application provides for either one of the power splitters 25 or 26 of FIG. 5 **but not both**, the main transmission filter 27, and the first and second feedback transmission filters 28 and 29. Assuming that the power splitter of claims 8, 10 and 13 corresponds to power splitter 25 of present FIG. 5, the structure recited in claims 8, 10, and 13 does **not provide a connection between port 29a of the second feedback transmission filter 29 and the fourth port 25d of the power splitter 25 in present FIG. 5**, as the reflector of claim 13 of the copending application feeds a signal received from port 29a back to the port 29a. Still further, the feedback arrangement recited in present claims 1, 2(Amended), and 3(Amended) does not require the elements of one or more lasers or radiating elements as required in claims 8, 10, and 13 of the copending application to provide a stabilized laser system. The arrangement of present claims 1,

2(Amended), and 3(Amended), although usable for stabilizing a laser system, could be used for other signal reflection purposes, since the spectral responses of the transmission filters recited in present claims 1, 2(Amended), and 3(Amended) are not limited to generating a feedback signal as is required in claim 8 of the copending application to stabilize one or more lasers. In light of the above discussion, applicants believe that claims 8, 10, and 13 of the copending application do not recite a structure that is the same or an obvious variation to that recited in present claims 1, 2(Amended), and 3(Amended), and should not be the subject of a double patenting rejection.

Turning now to the double patenting rejection of present claim 7 as related to the combination of claims 8, 29, 35, and 36 of copending Patent application No. 10/776,808. Applicants traverse such double patenting rejection. Present claim 7 recites the structure of a reflector arrangement, as is shown in present FIG. 8, providing a twisted loop reflector arrangement that is adaptable to accommodate output signals from a plurality of non-claimed remote signal sources. The reflector arrangement of present claim 7, and shown in present FIG. 8, is reproduced in partial recitations of the total combination of claims 8, 29, 35, and 36 of the copending application. However, the reflector arrangement of present claim 7 does not recite **the requirement of a plurality of lasers that operate in the manner recited in claim 8, or a feedback signal generating means that must generate a specific predetermined feedback signal to the plurality of lasers to provide a stabilized laser system as is recited in claim 8.**

The arrangement of present claim 7, although usable for stabilizing a laser system, could be used for other signal reflection purposes, since the spectral responses of the multiplexer/demultiplexers recited in present claim 7 are not limited to generating a feedback signal as is required and recited in claim 8 of the copending application to stabilize a plurality of lasers. In light of the above discussion, applicants believe that claims 8, 10, and 13 of the copending application do not provide an overall structure that is similar to that recited in present claim 7, and should not be the subject of a double patenting rejection.

Applicants' attorney has talked with Supervisory Patent Examiner Harvey who has the herein cited copending application on her docket for examination by one of the Examiners in her art unit. Examiner Harvey has agreed to expediate examination of the copending application. In view of the fact that the present application and the cited copending application were filed concurrently and that prosecution in both will be close in time, it has been decided to overcome the double patenting rejection in the present case via the filing of a terminal disclaimer which is attached hereto.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4, 5, and 6 are objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claims 2, 3, 4, and 5 to remove the subject matter (delay lines) not shown in the drawings, and are

submitting herewith a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, applicants believe that claims 1, 2 (Amended), 3 (Amended), 4 (Amended), and 5 (Amended), 6, 7, and newly added 12 are now condition for allowance.

The Examiner has cited U.S. Patent No. 4,482,203 (Stowe et al.), issued in November 1984, U.S. Patent No. 4,483,582 (Sheem), issued in November 1984, U.S. Patent No. 6,385,217 (Singh et al.), issued in May 2002, and United Kingdom Patent No. GB 2,158,649 (Overbury), issued in November 1985, as being pertinent, but has not applied any of these references against the present claims. Applicants have reviewed these references and have determined that they do not anticipate, in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 102, or make obvious, in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103, the present invention as claimed in claims 1, 2 (Amended), 3 (Amended), 4 (Amended), 5 (Amended), 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and newly added claim 12.

Claims 1, 2 (Amended), 3 (Amended), 4 (Amended), and 5 (Amended), 6, 7, 8, and newly added claim 12 remain in the application and are believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 8, 9, 10, and 11 have been allowed and remain in the application.

In conclusion, the application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable action to this effect is respectfully requested. If for some reason the Examiner does not believe that the application is now in condition for allowance, and that a further interview or telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the

Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' attorney at Area
Code (908) 464-0248.

Respectfully submitted,
Hongmin Chen, Hamid Khazaei,
Hsing Cheng, and
David Kirk Lewis, Applicants

By: 

Irwin Ostroff
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,013

Dated: June 27, 2005

Att: Terminal Disclaimer
Tel. No. (908) 464-0248
Fax. No. (908) 464-3431